RESPONSE

This is a response to the Office Action dated April 6, 2006. The Examiner objected to claims 49, 52, 53, 55, 67 and 92 for typographical errors. With this response claims 49, 52, 53, 55, 67 and 92 have been amended to correct the informalities. Additional informalities have been corrected with amendments to claims 51, 57, 58, 60, 65, 66, 84 and 90. The Examiner has rejected claims 49, 67, and 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. In addition, claims 49, 67, and 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 49-50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66-72, 77-83, 85, 88, and 90-93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,401,075 ("Mason"). Claims 52, 53, and 74-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,382 ("Sparks"). Claims 51, 60, 62-63, 65, 73, 84, 86-87, 89, and 94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of Official Notice.

The rejections from the Office Action of April 6, 2006 are discussed below. No new matter has been added. Various claims have been amended for clarity and not for reasons related to patentability. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 49, 67, and 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement and under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. With this response, claims 49, 67, and 92 have been amended to remove the negative limitation. Applicants believe there is support in the specification for the claim as amended because as the Examiner has noted, "there is support in the specification that a marketer may budget a maximum amount to spend on an advertising campaign." Office Action of 04/06/06, pp. 3-4.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 49-50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66-72, 77-83, 85, 88, and 90-93 as being anticipated by Mason. Mason discloses methods "for obtaining Internet-type advertisements to fit designated advertising spaces allotted by a plurality of different and

unrelated online newspaper websites, and automatically placing those advertisements." Mason, Abstract.

Mason fails to disclose that "when the advertisement is deemed not approved, the advertisement campaign is rejected" as in amended claims 49, 67 and 92. Mason does disclose that a derivate advertisement may be displayed for somebody such as an art director for final approval. Col. 5, ll. 53-57. If the ad is approved then it is stored for placement, but if it is not approved, then a new image is created and uploaded. Col. 5, ll. 58-61. Accordingly, the advertisement in Mason is replaced if it is not approved. However, as in amended claims 49, 67 and 92, if the advertisement is not approved, then the advertisement *campaign* is rejected. Mason discloses that if the ad is not approved, then it is replaced. *Id.* Accordingly, the advertisement campaign is not rejected, rather a new advertisement replaces the original advertisement and the campaign continues in Mason. *Id.* Conversely, the claims disclose that if the ad is not approved, the *campaign* is rejected. Accordingly, Mason fails to disclose the rejection of an advertisement campaign because an ad that is not approved is replaced.

Further, the claims, as amended, include that the advertisement campaign includes a plurality of advertisements. Mason fails to disclose that if an advertisement is not approved, then the advertisement *campaign* is rejected. Rather, the advertisement is rejected in Mason, not the advertisement campaign including a plurality of advertisements.

Mason also fails to disclose a request received over a computer network to initiate an advertisement campaign as disclosed in the claims. Specifically, Mason fails to disclose that the request includes a maximum amount to spend on the advertisement campaign. Mason discloses the billing of an advertiser by a person utilizing one or more methods. Col. 5, ll. 4-6. The advertiser may purchase advertising space for a length of time, by the number of hits, or by the number of click-throughs. Col. 5, ll. 6-9. There is no disclosure of a request over a network, and specifically, there is no disclosure of a request including a maximum amount to spend on an advertisement campaign. Although Mason does disclose the purchase of a set number of hits or click-throughs, this is not a disclosure of a maximum amount for a campaign that is present in the request. A user of the Mason system may purchase multiple click-throughs regardless of a budget that may exist. The claims disclose that an advertising campaign is run only until the maximum amount has been spent for the campaign. Accordingly, the purchase of a number of click-throughs is not a maximum amount of an advertisement campaign.

For the reasons described above, Applicants submit that independent claims 49, 67 and 92 are allowable. Likewise, claims dependent from allowable claims 49, 67 and 92 are also allowable. Specifically, dependent claims 50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66, 68-72, 77-83, 85, 88, 90, 91, and 93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over Mason. For the reasons discussed above, Applicants submit that dependent claims 50, 54-59, 61, 64, 66, 68-72, 77-83, 85, 88, 90, 91, and 93 are allowable.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 52, 53, and 74-76 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of Sparks. Sparks relates to the design and production of print advertising and commercial display materials over the Internet. Sparks, Abstract. Sparks fails to disclose the rejection of an advertisement campaign and the request with a maximum amount as in independent claims 49 and 67. Therefore, dependent claims 53, 75 and 76 should be allowed for the reasons discussed above.

Claims 51, 60, 62-63, 65, 73, 84, 86-87, 89, and 94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mason in view of Official Notice. The Official Notice relates to the display of advertisements on a wireless devices, the advertisement placement, advertisement costs per click, advertisement costs per impression, etc. There is not Official Notice of the rejection of an advertisement campaign and the request with a maximum amount as in independent claims 49, 67 and 92. Therefore, dependent claims 51, 60, 62-63, 65, 73, 84, 86-87, 89, and 94 should be allowed for the reasons discussed above.

IV. CONCLUSION

Each of the rejections in the Office Action dated April 6, 2006 have been addressed and no new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

July 6, 2006
Date

Scott A. Timmerman
Registration No. 55,678
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200